

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION

DEDRICK MATTHEWS §
v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:14cv784
LINDA RHYMES, ET AL. §

MEMORANDUM ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
AND ENTERING FINAL JUDGMENT

The Plaintiff Dedrick Matthews, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil rights lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. §1983 complaining of alleged violations of his constitutional rights. This Court ordered that the case be referred to the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1) and (3) and the Amended Order for the Adoption of Local Rules for the Assignment of Duties to United States Magistrate Judges.

Matthews complained that the Smith County District Clerk failed to have a copy of his state habeas petition delivered to the district attorney's office for a response. After review of the pleadings, the magistrate judge issued a report recommending that the lawsuit be dismissed as frivolous and for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Matthews received a copy of this report but filed no objections thereto; accordingly, he is barred from *de novo* review by the district judge of those findings, conclusions, and recommendations and, except upon grounds of plain error, from appellate review of the unobjected-to factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the district court. *Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*).

The Court has reviewed the pleadings and evidence in this cause and the report of the magistrate judge. Upon such review, the Court has determined that the report of the magistrate judge is correct. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918,

109 S.Ct. 3243 (1989) (where no objections to a magistrate judge's report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law."). It is accordingly

ORDERED that the report of the magistrate judge (docket no. 9) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

ORDERED that the above-styled civil action is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** as frivolous and for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B). Finally, it is

ORDERED that any and all motions which may be pending in this action are hereby **DENIED**.

It is SO ORDERED.

SIGNED this 5th day of May, 2015.



MICHAEL H. SCHNEIDER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE